

# Ray and Mary LaFontaine's "Journalism"

Ray and Mary LaFontaine say they are journalists. In fact they are scandal-mongers, making their scandals up as they go. Their book, Oswald Talked, is a case in point. That title is a lie. Oswald did not "talk." He was not, as they also made up, a police <sup>informe</sup> snitch who snitched on a minor stolen gun case.

The subtitle of their book is also a lie. It is "The New Evidence in the JFK Assassination." In fact there is ~~nowhere~~ nothing "new" in what they claim as new/and it has nothing at all to do with the JFK assassination.

There is no limit to the other false claims they make. For example, also on their dust cover, that their "book provides more new documented evidence than any book in twenty years." We'll see how false this is. Also false is their next claim, that they do "not rely on unreliable witness' testimony [sic]" which they in fact depend on entirely.

Their publisher, Pelican, under the utterly false heading "No More Conspiracy Speculations and suspicions" adds additional falsehood in stating that their's is "the Kennedy book that names the players in the cover-up and how they did it."

A bigger lie is not easily made up.

The book has nothing at all to do with the JFK assassination. It has not a word about who covered what ~~assassination~~ evidence up or how or why they did that.

The book is not in fact about the assassination at all. As in the past, the LaFontaines were seeking sensation, the cheapest sensation; and having gotten nowhere with such irrelevancies as those Dealey Plaza trash who had nothing at all to do with Dealey Plaza or the assassination they have this <sup>in</sup> substitute for fact and reality invented book for their sensation.

It was easy for them because they began as and remain subject-matter ignoramuses. About which it is easy to write at book length, they are that ignorant, that self-important in their ignorance and that stupid in what they write. Their ~~arrogance~~ arrogance and ~~stupid~~ stupidity are unequaled in the field.

When they are criticized they find it necessary to attack those who criticize them,

as they do Steve Bochan. They ~~exhibit contempt~~ did not respond to my pre-publication criticism as they could not, so they opt the coward's choice and lie about me in their book, to which I could make no response. If they did not know they were lying in what they said about me they are even more ignorant than from their ~~writing~~ writing they appear to be.

It is past time for the La Fontaines to <sup>have learned</sup> learned about throwing stones from glass houses.

Two years ago they had a lengthy article in the Washington Post mistitled "The Fourth Tramp." It supposedly is about John <sup>Franklin</sup> Elrod, who was arrested separately from those three who were tramps <sup>and</sup> was not a tramp. He was a cook.

In that article the LaFontaines restructured the Dallas city jail to have it conform to what they had made up, that Elrod heard Oswald confess to what the LaFontaines wrote their work of mistitled fiction about being a police snitch. In that article the jail's maximum security section was where those in it saw anyone using the elevators, which is false, and that block had a thin back wall through which all ~~this~~ they made up could be heard, also false.

As a record for history, not for publication, I wrote the Post about the errors in the LaFontaine "news" journalism. Jefferson Morely, who sold the Post <sup>goods</sup> that LaFontaine bill of ~~lies~~ geos, asked if he could send it to them.

"Of course," I told him, adding, "And I'll respond in writing to anything they may say about what I wrote."

Then my friend Jim Leavelle, the retired Dallas detective who was handcuffed to Oswald when Ruby killed him, ~~sent~~ sent me a sketch of that jail. He also stated that the back wall of that block was of exceptionally thick steel and that words could not be heard through it. ~~Morely sent them that, too.~~

The LaFontaines did not write me a word about what I <sup>N</sup>~~wrote~~ sent the Post and the Post sent them. They revised what they had made up about the jail to give a different version that is still only a fabrication.

They also abuse the decent and concerned Silvia.

*This*  
Odio, which is also essential to their fabricated claim to fame and fortune.

Their fiction is that she held back from the government and in effect prevented a planned invasion of Cuba that would have gotten rid of Cuba. The last part is not even childish. The first part is indecent beyond exaggeration.

Remember their claim ~~not~~ to use "theories," not to use what they refer to as "~~an~~ unreliable 'witness' testimony?" So they say of Odio, now in her grandmother years, that she "had betrayed her parents to the Cuban authorities and was in reality the mistress of Fidel Castro" (page 267). This they attribute to what an enemy of Odio's wrote in a book, her claimed source being "a private detective" she hired in her campaign ~~against~~ ~~against~~ ~~against~~ odio.

This is an outrageous indecency and with Odio's husband, ~~small~~ children *from Cuba* and their flight ~~it~~ was also an obvious impossibility.

Sloppy in their writing as in their thinking the La Fontaines also say of Odio the exact opposite when they wrote of her ~~was~~ that "With ~~the~~ imprisoned parents and a lost society to avenge it would have been contemptible for a person of spirit not to try to do something" (page 241).

The LaFontaines' are not small minds to be hogtied by consistency. They have it both ways.

What they say of me and what I wrote of Odio they have in a note:

32. In his apparent zeal to protect Silvia as one of his star witnesses to conspiracy, Harold Weisberg quotes her verbatim from the Secret Service report—right up to the mention of Cisneros, at which point Weisberg interposes himself to suppress the tell-tale name. Thus: "She advised him [Machann] the only information she could provide on the people who visited her was, *in effect, what she had already said*" (emphasis added) (*Oswald in New Orleans*, 287). Here Weisberg entirely misleads his readers. What she actually told Machann was anything but "what she had already said." (page 425)

*Therefore we can't believe her to be reliable*

~~join~~ Their first sentence is ~~saying~~, a deliberate lie, and what is not a lie in the rest is irrelevant to what I was writing about.

I brought Odio and her testimony to light in the first book on the Warren Commission and the assassination, my 1965 "Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report." I carried this further in my next book, Whitewash II, which was published in 1966. Remember what the LaFontaines claimed about going to first sources? Well, they did not have either of these books in their bibliography (page 454).

It is at the end of Chapter 11 of "Whitewash," titled "The False Oswald," that I was the first to write about Odio and her <sup>own</sup> testimony (pages 153-4).

And, contrary to what the LaFontaines say I said, I did say "It was not Oswald" who visited her.

Odio was not my ~~prime~~ "star witness to conspiracy" as the LaFontaines make up and I was not trying to "protect her" in what I actually wrote. Nor did I quote all of that Secret Service report "verbatim" as they also say "right up to the mention of Cisneros." They then say that I "interposed" myself to suppress ~~that tell-tale name.~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>imagine</sup> that tell-tale name. It has meaning in only the childish LeFontaine fabrication of the coming invasion of Cuba and Castro's overthrow they ~~hope~~ was to be pulled off by 14 students!

What the LaFontaines refer to is on page 287 of Oswald in New Orleans. But what I was writing about is stated at the beginning of that part of that book: "What can we know about the men in the story of The False Oswald?" (page 260).

I was writing about the falsification of Oswald and could not have been more specific in stating this in all three of those books. I ~~refuse~~ <sup>and</sup> to the one who visited Odio not as Oswald ~~but~~ not as an assassin ~~but~~ as "The False Oswald."

In the plain English that is more than justified, the LaFontaines lied knowing they were lying because they could not respond to my criticisms and were out to <sup>e/</sup> ~~trust~~ <sup>are liars too,</sup> get revenge. So, their readers ~~also paid for it.~~

*Essential in*

Their nonsense about the allegedly aborted invasion of Cuba was to have been led by the student, Fermín de ~~Sánchez~~ Goicochea. They were to have been "armed by weapons stolen from a large U.S. Army post at Killeen, Texas, Fort Hood (page 277).  
*failure of the*

Not only was it childish to think that with the full force of the Bay of Pigs invaders and the arms ~~the~~ CIA gave them and the advance bombing by air that the ragtag DRE could have pulled off what the LaFontaines make up - ~~Castro~~ had in the interim been rearmed extensively by the USSR.

They quote the CIA as on this ~~childish~~ <sup>in</sup> this childish alleged invasion plan they inflate so enormously as calling it "somewhat romantic" (page 294). At the same point they also quote the CIA as saying that support for it "would not be possible."

That kid stuff also called for the CIA to provide a ~~farm~~ <sup>farm</sup> outside the United States, which the CIA would not do (page 294).

*It is all preposterous, less sensible than childlessness, but vital in this LaFontaine fabrication.*

It is, supposedly, about this theft of Army weapons that Oswald, in the La Fontaine fabrication, "talked" to the police leading to the arrest of some of those gunrunners and the end of the alleged coming invasion of Cuba.

Not having the facts of the LaFontaines the Dallas Morning News did not attribute the arrest of those men to Oswald's talking. Its story, not in the LaFontaine book, reads:

The chase started, patrolman J.B. Allen and J.R. Sales said, when they saw the northbound car run a red light at Allen. When they tried to stop the car, it sped north at speeds up to <sup>80 my</sup> 80 miles an hour. Five blocks away at Hall and Junius, the contraband laden ~~xxxmilia~~ convertible plunged between two autos halted for a red light. It ~~sideswiped~~ sideswiped both and squealed on toward Gaston,

Where it "crashed head on into a utility pole.

There <sup>were</sup> a total of five weapons in that car, hardly enough for the minuscule *and only imagined*

planned invasion of ~~of~~ fourteen students.

and with these kind of amateurs running those guns, not only was no snitch required, the actualities prove there was no snitch. Not Oswald, Not any other. *Out of nothing at all the LaFontaines made it all up,* that "new evidence" of which the determinedly ignorant LaFontaines are so ~~too~~ proud <sup>long</sup> was not new before they were bitten by the assassination bug. It also was Not brought to light by their derringde <sup>W</sup>researcher ~~at~~ <sup>in</sup> Silicon Valley ~~cav~~ cavalry, their "eminently sane" her<sup>o</sup> and guru, "Bill Adams, the man who started it all with his discovery of the August 11, 1964 FBI report on John Franklin Elrod," (page 96 and elsewhere)

In the LaFontaine version it was necessary for Adams to fight a series of <sup>w/</sup> ~~Act efforts~~ Freedom of Information Setbacks to be bring this "new" and sensational doope to light.

All Adams or anyone else had to do was go into the FBI's public reading room and ask to see it, or writing the FBI and ask for copies because all of it and more had been made public as a result of two of my FOIA lawsuit and ~~that~~

long before that same bug bit Adams, too.

(I doubt you will want to publish them but I enclose some of these FBI reports.) <sup>in handwritten</sup> It is specific that the FBI's investigation of those "tramps" was forced by my giving it pictures of them and of the sketch said to have been of the assassin of Martin Luther King, Jr., which was virtually trace <sup>d/</sup> from one of those pictures. (Memphis file 44-1987- Sub b, serial 56).

That investigation, the third for which was responsible in that one year, 1968, <sup>admission</sup> made it obvious that those tramps had no relevance at all <sup>so</sup> neither I nor anyone else, not ~~see before~~ sensation seekers or mangers, had any interest in going any further and wasting any time on learning the ~~the~~ names of those irrelevant winos. <sup>which</sup> ~~then is~~ what they were.

With regard to ~~Elrod~~ Elrod's alleged knowledge of the assassination, the FBI states unequivocally that he "emphatically denied ~~any~~ knowledge of the assassination or the involvement of Ruby in killing Oswald." (FBI 105-82555-4726) (C)

Elrod was drunk. He turned himself in, armed as he was with an illegal sawed-off shotgun, because he ~~was~~ afraid he'd kill his wife with it. <sup>it had</sup> Nothing at all to do with the assassination <sup>in</sup> any way at all.

<sup>my</sup> All of these ~~and~~ other records like them were forced out of secrecy by ~~by~~ Civil Actions # 75-1996, # 78-0322 and 78-0420, all long before any of this Adams heroism and LaFontaine fabrication based on ~~them~~. <sup>it, These Records</sup> They have been freely available to all writing in the field at my hand, as even ~~Gerald Posner~~ attests, and in the FBI's public reading room beginning in the summer of 1976. ~~-forty years~~

It is based on the LaFontaine fabrications that they have their book in which they also claim, basic as it is in their book, that Elrod also talked".

Like Oswald, he did not and the LaFontaines know he did not and would not!

What they write about as the pinnacle of modern United States journalism is the scandal-loving, supermarket-tabloid TV supposed news programs. They are so proud of their "journalism" on Hard Copy for November 16, 1993, <sup>it was</sup> attractive to Hard Copy because of the coming thirtieth assassination anniversary. They write in ~~their~~ book that in preparing for this show, which they, "Desperado ~~Production~~" Productions" as they call themselves, produced.

On it they aired Elrod. And he steadfastly refused absolutely, <sup>To say a</sup> ~~they have in their book~~ single thing other than that he could get in trouble. he refused absolutely to say what ~~in their book they claim he said~~, In the <sup>tiny</sup> book they state their interviews filled thirty-three cassettes. And in all that they could not get Elrod even to hint at what they base their book on stating that he said.

My copy of that transcript was provided by their second major source, from <sup>(Oja)</sup> their book, my friend of more than thirty yrs, Paul Heck Hoch. Paul had nothing to do with what the LaFontaine's wrote and it is conspicuous they have no plug from him on their book.

In plain English, as I state to begin with, the La Fontaines make it all up and in addition lie with determination.

Oswald did not talk <sup>to</sup> and there was no need for him to have for what happened <sup>(O)</sup>

There was no need for him or for anyone ~~else~~ to have "talked," been any kind of police snitch,

Elrod not only did not say what the LaFontaines base their book on his having said, he steadfastly refused to say that or anything like it when pressured to for hours. Those tales of which they boast represent sixteen and a half hours that were taped ~~alone~~. *all the time they leaned on Elrod.*

With the LaFontaine record of defaming all who do not agree with them they ~~use of less pointed~~ do not deserve words being less pointed. They are, without any question, liars. They make up what they want to have believed and do that throughout their trashy book. They began and they remain subject-matter ignoramuses.

To go into ~~all~~ there is of this in their book would take book length but ~~I add~~ *little* few if any illustrations make the point. Like their other plain, straightforward lie of Oswald snitching to the FBI about a Cuban camp near New Orleans. That is ~~about~~ *they knew damn well* ~~what they have is~~ *baseless* all conjecture where it is not all straight-out fabrication.

They have Guy Banister still working for the FBI "with contract assignments," something they made up, the FBI not having them. Banister left the FBI because he was not up to its medical standards. He did not last long on the New Orleans *Murder*, police, either. ~~But~~ There was no sense at all in their conjecture that "Oswald was in New Orleans to keep tabs on Banister." Not for the FBI and not for anyone else. That he was ~~equipped~~ for any such work is also made up from nothing. That kind of job requires skills and ~~no~~ training Oswald did not have. *All childish story-book stuff.* (page 132.)

It is also a ~~very~~ straightforward lie that Banister "provided an upstairs office to store leaflets and other paraphanalia," (page 133). In all Oswald had a mere thousand sheets of paper, what could easily be carried in one hand, plus a few, very few, ~~FPG~~ pamphlets. For these and his two picket signs (which the LaFontaines know nothing about and ~~say~~ nothing about) he had no need for any office or other space. His home was not ~~ever~~ cramped by them and he did not take ~~all~~ any one picketing. When he was all finished he had some left over. They attracted ~~little~~ little interest.

Utterly lost without conjecture the LaFontaines conjecture what did not happen and Oswald did not intend to happen, "that Oswald would develop his seemingly collaborative relationship with the DRE," the "relationship" that did not exist. Also the relationship they make up out of nothing that "may have been planned by [Warren] de Brueys" (page 133).

To "the" penetrate the one-man DRE of Carlos Bringuer? Who could not have been more public in all his many futilities? But the LaFontaines say that is what Oswald did, "penetrate the Bringuer organization for the FBI" (page 133). The FBI had ~~had~~ no such need, not that it was not impossible anyway, not that Oswald and ~~and~~ ~~but~~ ~~Bringuer knew anything or meant anything.~~ made any such effort of any kind. He went to Bringuer's twice, only. The second time Bringuer was not even there. Some "penetration" that is! With great value and ~~less~~ importance for the FBI, too!! *(How silly, kid stuff! Who did natural!)*

So, they have Oswald what they call "the Fontchartrain informant" and they have "word ~~ex~~ gradually seep through via Banister's ~~sixth~~ FBI grapevine," all imagined, non-existing and none serving any purpose if it had existed except to assassination nuts who get carried away with their own imaginations and ignorance,

What actually happened is that there was no snitch on that matter of the raid about which the LaFontaines write with their usual lack of any knowledge at all and with what they make up, lacking even the knowing knowledge ~~to~~ required to make up anything sensible ~~at all.~~ *(in that area.)*

There were three so-called Cuban camps. At none was there any training.

The two that were ~~not~~ known were in small houses. My sources are the cooperative St. Tammany Parish sheriff's office and deputies; the man who had one of those camps, Rudolph *(Ricardo) Davis*, and the man who actually reported the danger he and others face ~~that~~ led to the raid about which the LaFontaines write so glibly ~~knowing~~ nothing at all about it.

The McLaney of mafia gambling operations in Cuba had a small summer place on the other side of ~~the~~ Lake Pontchartrain from where he lived in New Orleans.

It was off of Pontchartrain drive, between Slidell and Lacombe. It was a small  
~~large~~  
frame house with no outbuildings, not even the tiniest shed. I know. I was  
there and I photographed it. While I was there the man who lived next door told me  
about seeing some Cubans ~~bring~~ bringing explosives <sup>up</sup> on an open U-Haul trailer  
behind an auto. Then, as they cleaned the place that had not been used for a long  
time up and they burned the trash they raked up they started a grass fire that  
could have made all the ~~explosives~~ explosives they brought in blow up and wreck the  
neighborhood. It is from this reasonable fear that this man who lived next door  
reported that danger of the authorities, thus the "raid."

~~such house~~  
David had another place of which he told me. The Sheriff took pictures of  
it for me when I ran out of time.

~~and~~ one of the deputies told me about an unknown camp that was in a woods  
along the lake shore. From it small fast boats set out for Cuba loaded with  
small arms. They ran a regular courier service.

~~There w<sup>t</sup> no~~ ~~for~~ ~~and they did not~~ need any weapons to be stolen from the Army as the La  
Fontaines just made up. The CIA had plenty of sources, as all agencies do and  
as unofficial people also can have if they want them. There is ~~qu~~ a trade  
in what goes boom.

~~La Fontaine's~~  
They ~~w<sup>t</sup>~~ political ignorance is displayed throughout the book. They  
~~assassination~~  
find covering the truth up justified because "no one knows what might have resulted  
...from an imprudent discovery ~~of~~ of an international conspiracy" or "agents of  
Fidel Castro with the suspected assassintance of the KGB" (page 246).

Castro was going to kill his only real insurance policy, Kennedy, who solved  
the 1962 missile crisis by guaranteeing to protect Cuba against any invasion,  
a guarantee even Khruschev could not give him?

But if this were not ~~so~~ so, what "assistance" would have been required  
of the KGB? Still again, children writing a cheap novel.

~~of~~ the USSR that was and for a ~~year~~ year had been trying to work out agreements  
~~It and Kennedy sought~~  
with the United States to reduce tensions and armaments, seeking ~~now~~ peace in which

Kennedy and Khrushchev exchanged about forty letters in their joint quest.

For those who are going to make up history ~~as~~ they seek fame and fortune from it, including those who have high opinions of their genius and do not need and ~~the understanding~~ fact that they do not have ~~anyway~~, ignorance sure helps. Ignorance alone ~~was~~ made possible what the LaFontaines wrote in this book, a book whose publisher did ~~not have~~ find the principle for the once-traditional peer reviews for honest nonfiction. This book ~~was~~ would have been laughed back to Pelican by any authentic subject expert! ☺

There is one way and only one way in which "Oswald Falaker!"

That is in ~~describing~~ proving that the LaFontaines are self-important phonies who make up their book ~~out~~ of nothing but conjectures and overt lies because, being subject-matter ignoramuses, there is no other way in which they can ~~ever~~ exploit and commercialize the assassination <sup>They</sup> and make up more scandals tragic as even they ~~can~~ sell ~~and~~ with that selling corrupt our history ~~more~~ than the government did not.

~~all~~ that they boast is "new" is new to them only, having been public almost twenty years before they their Silicon Valley cavalry, not knowing it was ~~all~~ public, made the ~~valiant~~ efforts the LaFontaines attribute to him to bring it to light for them!

What was all freely available long before the ~~assassination~~ bit them and they were ~~all~~ too ignorant to know it, including ~~this~~ that "cavalry" of theirs who with them has yet to distinguish between the ends of horses.

The LaFontaines prove all over again that it is not possible to write responsibly or even honestly about the assassination and its investigations without knowing and knowing the meaning of the information that has been disclosed. Those ~~who~~ <sup>they</sup> ~~has~~ written without this preparation, even with good intentions, cannot avoid deceiving and misleading the people and burying the truth even deeper in what inevitably becomes their quest for fame and fortune as they exploit and commercialize this great tragedy in our history. They rip off the mind while they rip off the purse.